

REMARKS

Pending in the application are claims 1, 2, 5-8, 11-13 and 17-20 of which claims 1, 6, 11 and 17 are independent. Claim 5 has been amended. The following comments address all stated grounds of rejection and place the presently pending claims, as identified above, in condition for allowance.

I. Claim Objections

Claim 5 is objected to on the basis of the informalities that it depends from canceled claim 4. In response to this objection of claim 5, Applicants have amended claim 5 to be in the form of an independent claim which incorporates all limitations recited in claim 1. In light of this amendment, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 5 is in condition for allowance.

II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 6-8 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,347,943 to Fields et al. (the '943 patent). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claims 6 and 11 recites a *fill-in-the-blank applet*. The applet is contained in a Web page and includes a *separate definition file*, which is unavailable to

the user, indicating *a correct answer to a question*, the definition file being separate from the HTML code containing the question to prevent the user from obtaining the correct answer by looking at the HTML code. The definition file can be altered, and subsequently used by the JAVA applet, without having to recompile or rejar the applet. Hence, the use of a definition file facilitates the correction of errors. For example, after the applet executes, if there is an error, such as a misspelled word in a message provided to the student, the misspelled word can be modified directly in the definition file, and the JAVA code run again, without having to recompile and/or rejar the applet.

The '943 patent discloses an electronic performance support system (EPSS) that is capable of providing for each user a customized course of instruction based on an assessment of each user's knowledgeability of a particular topic. In FIG. 1, the '943 patent discloses an authoring mechanism (1) and a learning environment (4). The learning environment includes an assessment mechanism (5), a learning mechanism (7), and a research library (9). The assessment mechanism is populated through the authoring mechanism with a plurality of pages on particular sub-topics.

Applicant respectfully submit that the '943 patent fails to disclose each of the claim elements of independent claims 6 and 11. The '943 patent discloses in column 4, lines 8-23 that the EPSS is a client/server-based network application that can run on a Web server and may be written in a programming language, such as Java 1.1, which enables customers to access the EPSS from an *applet viewer* or Web browser, such as

Netscape, so that anyone with internet access can run the EPSS from their computer. The '943 patent discloses an applet viewer which enables customers to access EPSS. The '943 patent fails to disclose a fill-in-the blank applet of the claimed invention that includes a definition file indicating a correct answer to a question.

In the '943 patent, authors can create assessment materials or learning materials in the authoring mechanism. The data files created in the authoring mechanism are stored in a server in a hierarchical directory structure including knowledge base, sub-environment (assessment) and module (See column 4, lines 26-57), and provided to users in the assessment mechanism. That is, the applet viewer receives an correct answer from the server and provides it to the users. On the other hand, the claimed invention recites that a correct answer is indicated by a definition file included in an applet. Therefore, the '943 patent fails to disclose that an applet includes a definition file indicating a correct answer to a question.

Additionally, the Examiner indicates that the templates disclosed in the '943 patent correspond to the definition file included in the applet of the claimed invention. Applicant respectfully disagree. The templates disclosed in the '943 patent are utilized to create assessment or learning materials in the authoring mechanism. The assessment or learning materials created using the templates are stored in the server and provided to users in the assessment mechanism or learning mechanism. On the other hand, the definition file of the claimed invention is included in the applet and indicates a correct

answer to a question. Therefore, the templates do not correspond to the definition file and the '943 patent fails to disclose that a definition file is included in the applet and indicates a correct answer to a question.

In light of the arguments set forth above, Applicants submit that the cited prior art of the '943 patent fails to anticipate each essential element of independent claims 6 and 11. Applicants therefore request the withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection to claims 6-8 and 11-13 as being anticipated by the '943 patent.

III. Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-2 and 17-20 are rejected under U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,347,943 of Fields et al. (the '943 patent) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,219,291 of Fong et al. (the '291 patent). Applicants respectfully submit that pending claims 1-2 and 17-20 are not obvious in light of the '943 patent and the '291 patent.

Independent claims 1 and 17 recites that an applet automatically provides a correct answer after the user surpasses a predetermined number of attempts. The student in a testing environment only has a predetermined number of attempts to answer the question, after which the answer is displayed to the student. In this manner, the student cannot keep guessing at the right answer until it is submitted.

The '291 patent discloses an electronic education video system for connection to a standard television receiver for teaching basic skills to a child through the use of animated graphic displays which serve to motivate the child to utilize the system and enhance the child's learning. The '291 patent discloses that if after three attempts the child is unable to provide the correct response, the correct answer will appear in place of the question mark.

Applicant respectfully submit that the cited prior art of the '943 patent and the '291 patent fail to teach or suggest all of the limitation of claims 1 and 17. As set forth above, the '943 patent fails to disclose that an applet includes a definition file indicating a correct answer to a question. The '943 patent also fails to teach or suggest that the applet provides the answer *automatically* after the user surpasses a predetermined number of attempts. The '943 patent discloses that if the user answers the question, the user has the *option* of validating the answer immediately. If the user chooses the validation, the assessment mechanism displays the correct answer accompanied by a short explanation in the feedback region.

Applicant respectfully submit that the '291 patent also fails to teach or suggest disclose that an applet automatically provides a correct answer after the user surpasses a predetermined number of attempts. The '291 patent is implemented in a stand-alone system, not in an on-line system. Therefore, the '291 patent fails to teach or suggest an

applet providing an correct answer automatically after a predetermined number of attempts.


In light of the aforementioned arguments, the cited prior art of the '943 patent and the '291 patent fails to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations of independent claims 1 and 17. The addition of dependent claims 2 and 18-20, which depend on aforementioned claims 1 or 17, does not therefor render the pending application obvious in light of the '943 patent and the '291 patent. Applicants therefore submit that claims 1, 2, 17-20 are in position for allowance.

Conclusion

In light of the aforementioned claim amendments, Applicants contend that each of the Examiners rejections have been adequately addressed and the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Attached hereto is a marked up version of the changes made to the claims by the current amendment. The attached page is captioned **"Version With Markings To show Changes Made"**. Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorney would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' attorney at (617) 227-7400.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin J. Canning, Esq.
Registration No. 35,470
Attorney for Applicant

LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP
28 State Street
Boston, MA 02109
(617) 227-7400

Dated: February 4, 2003



VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

In the Claims:

RECEIVED

FEB 20 2003

Please amend claims 5 and 11 as follows.

TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

5. (Amended) [The method of claim 4]In an electronic device that provides an on-line educational course, a method comprising:

providing an interactive fill-in-the-blank applet, wherein said applet generates a graphical user interface displaying a text box, a question and instructions to a user to enter an answer to the question in the text box; and

forwarding the applet from the electronic device to a remote client, wherein said applet automatically provides a correct answer in the text box after the user surpasses a predetermined number of attempts, [wherein said applet]and prevents the user from entering an answer after said predetermined number of attempts.

11. (Amended) A computer-readable medium for use in an electronic device that provides an on-line educational course, comprising

instructions for running a fill-in-the-blank applet for displaying a question and a text box to a user, wherein the user can enter an answer to the question in the text box, the medium including hypertext markup language (HTML) code, which includes the question, to reference the applet; and

a definition file, included in the applet and unavailable to the user, indicating a correct answer for said question, said definition file being separate from the HTML code to prevent the user from obtaining the correct answer by looking at the HTML code.